Dawn Cart



#### **MEMORANDUM**

TO:

LONG TERM AND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COMMITTEE

THOMAS J. PULLIAM, MD, CHAIRMAN

FROM:

DAWN CARTER, PRESIDENT, HEALTH PLANNING SOURCE

SUBJECT:

ADDITION TO INPATIENT HOSPICE METHODOLOGY

DATE:

MARCH 3, 2010

Health Planning Source (HPS) recommends one addition to the hospice inpatient bed methodology for the 2011 State Medical Facilities Plan (SMFP). HPS served as a resource for the Hospice Methodology Task Force that developed the draft hospice methodologies adopted in the 2010 SMFP. After the publication of the draft hospice methodologies, The Carolinas Center for Hospice and End of Life Care, which also served as a resource to the Task Force, received feedback from a member noting that in some counties the inpatient bed methodology projected hospice admissions beyond what could reasonably be expected. Based on this comment and further analysis, HPS believes that an additional step should be incorporated into the inpatient bed methodology. HPS proposed this change in July of 2009, however, the Planning Section did not take any action as the proposal did not affect need determinations. Thus, HPS is resubmitting its comment.

Specifically, HPS recommends that the projected hospice admissions, as calculated in the inpatient bed methodology, be capped at a level equivalent to a 60 percent hospice penetration rate for each county. HPS believes that this additional step will ensure that the hospice inpatient bed methodology more accurately projects inpatient bed need and also will ensure consistency between the inpatient bed and home care office methodologies. As noted above, the proposed modification did not result in a change of the 2010 SMFP hospice inpatient bed need determinations; however, it may affect need determinations in the 2011 SMFP and in future years.

The proposed step mimics the step in the hospice home care office methodology that caps projected hospice deaths at a level equivalent to a 60 percent hospice penetration rate for each county. The 60 percent penetration rate cap was added to the home care office methodology in order to ensure that projected deaths served by hospice did not reach unreasonably high levels when compared to total deaths. Without the 60 percent penetration rate cap in the home care office methodology, projected deaths served by hospice could exceed total deaths in certain counties.

Likewise, without the proposed step, the inpatient bed methodology could project admissions beyond what can reasonably be expected in certain counties. For example in the 2010 SMFP, Henderson County is projected to have 1,420 total deaths in 2013, based on the 2003 to 2007 death rate and the projected 2013 population. As now proposed, the home care methodology caps future growth in Henderson County hospice deaths to 825 deaths in 2011, or, if extended forward, to 852 deaths 2013. However, according to the inpatient bed methodology in the 2010 SMFP, Henderson County is projected to have 1,152 hospice admissions in 2013, which corresponds to 1,047 hospice

deaths and a hospice penetration rate of 74 percent (in 2008, Henderson County experienced a hospice admission to death ratio of 1.1 [1.1 hospice admissions to deaths = 841 admission ÷ 764 deaths]. As such, without the proposed step Henderson County would be projected to have 1,047 hospice deaths in 2013 [1,047 hospice deaths = 1,152 hospice admissions ÷ 1.1 hospice admissions to deaths]), compared to 852 deaths based on an extension of the home care methodology.

In the 2010 SMFP, nine counties, including the county of The Carolinas Center for Hospice and End of Life Care member who noted this issue, demonstrated 2013 projected hospice admission levels that would equate to hospice death penetration rates above 60 percent. HPS believes that the inpatient bed methodology should incorporate a 60 percent penetration rate cap in order to ensure that growth in projected hospice admissions does not exceed the 60 percent cap reflected in the home care methodology.

The 60 percent penetration rate cap in the home care office methodology does <u>not</u> affect need determinations as only counties that demonstrate a surplus of patients (i.e. counties that serve more patients than are served, on average, statewide) are capped. Thus, the cap is only applied in order to ensure that the methodology does not present projections that are unreasonable. The case for such a cap is even stronger for the inpatient bed methodology as it <u>may</u> affect future need determinations by capping unreasonably high growth in projected admissions and subsequently patient days and the number of inpatient beds needed.

Given the above reasons, HPS recommends that the SHCC adopt the proposed step that is outlined in detail in the attached revised Hospice Chapter narrative and Table 13C using the 2010 SMFP. All proposed changes to the 2010 SMFP are highlighted in yellow.

### CHAPTER 13 HOSPICE SERVICES

# Summary of Hospice Services and Supply

In June 2009, there were 263 hospice facilities (including hospice home care facilities and hospice inpatient and residential facilities) listed as being separately licensed in North Carolina according to the North Carolina Division of Health Service Regulation.

According to the hospice licensure law, as passed by the N.C. General Assembly in 1984, a hospice must provide home care services to terminally ill patients with a life expectancy generally not to exceed six months and their families, with provision for inpatient care or hospice residential care, as long as hospice inpatient is provided directly or through a contractual agreement. Data reported on the 2009 Licensure Renewal Applications indicate that over 39,000 hospice patients were served in 2007-2008.

There are 29 hospice inpatient facilities (comprising 248 beds) located in North Carolina, providing acute symptom control and pain management for hospice patients. Of the 29 facilities, 27 are free-standing hospice inpatient units -- located in Alamance, Buncombe, Cabarrus, Caldwell, Catawba, Cleveland, Cumberland, Davidson, Duplin, Durham, Forsyth, Gaston, Guilford, Harnett, Henderson, Iredell, Mecklenburg, New Hanover, Orange, Pitt, Robeson, Rockingham, Rutherford, Scotland, Surry and Wayne counties. Two hospitals have hospice inpatient units as a part of the hospital, located in Mecklenburg and Wake counties. Hospice inpatient facilities located in Beaufort, Brunswick, Burke, Caldwell, Cleveland, Columbus, Gaston, Johnston, Moore, Nash, Randolph, Richmond, Robeson, Rowan, Union, and Wake counties will add a total of 111 beds. Further, additions to facilities in Alamance, Forsyth, Harnett, Robeson, Rutherford and Wayne counties will add 31 beds.

There are 21 hospice residential facilities (comprising 149 beds) currently providing residential hospice care for patients who have frail and elderly caregivers or who live alone. These facilities are located in Alamance, Buncombe, Burke, Cabarrus, Catawba, Cleveland, Davidson, Duplin, Forsyth, Gaston, Guilford, Iredell, Mecklenburg, Richmond, Rockingham, Rutherford, Scotland, Surry, Union, and Wayne counties. The hospice residential facilities being developed in Caldwell, Cleveland, Gaston, Johnston, Nash, Randolph, Rowan, Union and Wake counties will add a total of 53 beds. Further, an addition to the Wayne County facility will add six beds and the Alamance County facility will add two beds.

# Changes from the Previous Plan

In 2008, based on the recommendation of it's Long-Term and Behavioral Health Committee, the State Health Coordinating Council authorized the formation of a Hospice Methodologies Task Force to make recommendations for the Proposed 2010 State Medical Facilities Plan.

An eleven member Task Force was formed and met four times. Represented on the group were members of the Council as well as hospice entities and a member of the general public. Serving as resource people were the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Carolinas Center

for Hospice and End of Life Care, the President of Health Planning Source and representatives of the Division of Medical Assistance, and the Division of Health Service Regulation Certificate of Need and Acute and Home Care Licensure and Certification Sections. The meetings were open to and attended by members of the public.

The Task Force presented its recommendations to the Long-Term and Behavioral Health Committee. The Committee accepted the recommendations which were subsequently approved by the Council for inclusion in the Proposed 2010 Plan.

### Hospice Home Care Offices:

The hospice home care methodology has been modified to utilize the two year trailing average growth rate in the number of deaths served and in the percent of deaths served. No need determinations are considered for counties with three or more hospice home care offices (excludes hospice inpatient and residential only facilities) per 100,000 population, as the data showed that counties in the state with a penetration rate of 40 percent or higher had three or fewer hospice home care offices located in the county and reporting service provision. The threshold for a need determination has been changed to a deficit of 90 or greater deaths, which represented the approximate number of deaths served at three hospice offices per 100,000 and a statewide median penetration rate (8.5 deaths per 1,000 [statewide death rate] x 100 = 850 deaths per 100,000 x 29.5 percent of deaths served = 251 deaths served by hospice / 3 hospice agencies = approx. 90). The placeholder for new hospice offices has been changed to the new threshold of 90 in order to maintain consistency.

# Hospice Inpatient Beds:

The hospice inpatient bed methodology has been modified to utilize projected hospice days of care calculated by multiplying projected hospice admissions by the lower of the statewide median average length of stay or the actual average length of stay for each county. This selection reduces the inclusion of days of care that may not be appropriate for an inpatient facility. Projected hospice admissions are determined by the application of the two year trailing average growth rate in the number of admissions served to current admissions. Inpatient days as a percent of total days of care are determined to be approximately six percent based on statewide inpatient days as a percent of total days of care.

For the North Carolina Proposed <u>2010 State Medical Facilities Plan</u> (SMFP), references to dates have been advanced by one year. The Task Force also recommended reviewing the hospice methodologies for the 2012 SMFP in order to determine the effect of all of these changes. Further, with regard to data reporting, The Carolinas Center for Hospice and End of Life Care and the Association for Home & Hospice Care of North Carolina will follow-up with the Division of Health Service Regulation's Acute and Home Care Licensure Section.

# Basic Assumptions of the Method

Hospice Home Care Offices:

1. County mortality (death) rates for the most recent years (2003-2007) are used as the basis for hospice patient need projection. The five-year death rate for 2003-2007 is used as an indicator of deaths from all sites in each county and is not affected by changes in actual deaths from year to year.

- 2. Because previous years' data are used as the bases for projections, the two year trailing average growth rate in statewide number of deaths served should be calculated over the previous three years and applied to the current reported number of deaths served to project changes in the capacity of existing agencies to serve deaths from each county by the target year. Hospice deaths served will not be projected to exceed 60 percent of total deaths.
- 3. Median projected hospice deaths is projected by applying a projected statewide median percent of deaths served by hospice to projected deaths in each county. Projected statewide median percent of deaths served should be calculated by applying the two year trailing average growth rate in the statewide median percent of deaths served over the previous three years to the current statewide median percent of deaths served.
- 4. An additional hospice is indicated if: 1) the county's deficit is 90 or more, and 2) the number of licensed hospice home care offices located in the county per 100,000 population is three or less.

### Hospice Inpatient Beds:

- 1. Because previous years' data are used as the bases for projections, the two year trailing average growth rate in statewide hospice admissions should be calculated over the previous three years and applied to the current reported number of hospice admissions to project total hospice admissions. Hospice admissions served will not be projected to exceed 60 percent of total deaths.
- 2. Total projected admissions and the lower of the statewide median average length of stay per admission and each county's average length of stay per admission are used as the basis for projecting estimated inpatient days for each county.
- 3. Six percent of total estimated days of care in each county is used as a basis for estimating days of care in licensed inpatient hospice facility beds.

# Hospice Residential Beds:

Rules for hospice residential beds were adopted by the Medical Care Commission in 1991. This category of beds does not have a methodology to project need and no need methodology has been recommended for the North Carolina Proposed 2010 State Medical Facilities Plan.

#### **Sources of Data**

#### Population:

Estimates and projections of population were obtained from the North Carolina Office of State Budget and Management.

Estimated active duty military population numbers were excluded for any county with more than 500 active duty military personnel. These estimates were obtained from the "Selected Economic Characteristics" portion of the 2000 Census, under the category of "Employment Status – Armed Forces."

#### **Number of Deaths and Death Rates:**

Deaths and death rates are from "Selected Vital Statistics for 2007 and 2003-2007, Vol. 1" published by the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services, State Center for Health Statistics.

#### **Utilization and Licensed Offices:**

Total reported hospice patient deaths, admissions, days of care and licensed offices by county were compiled from the "2009 Annual Data Supplement to Licensure Application" as submitted to the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Health Service Regulation by existing licensed hospices and by home care agencies and health departments who meet the requirements of the rules for hospice licensure.

# Application of the Standard Methodology

The steps in applying the projection methods are as follows:

### **Hospice Home Care Offices:**

Step 1: The 2003-2007 death rate/1000 population is entered.

Step 2: The estimated 2011 population of each county is entered with adjustments for the counties with more than 500 active duty military personnel.

Step 3: Projected 2011 deaths for each county is calculated by multiplying the county death rate (Step 1) by the 2011 estimated population (Step 2) divided by 1000.

Step 4: The total number of reported hospice patient deaths, by county of patient residence, from annual data supplements to licensure applications is entered.

<u>Step 5</u>: The "Two Year Trailing Average Growth Rate in Statewide Number of Deaths Served" over the previous three years is calculated.

Year	Statewide # Deaths Served	Growth
2006	22,653	
2007	24,897	9.9%
2008	26,353	5.8%
Two Year Trailing	Average Growth Rate	7.9%

Step 6a: 2011 number of hospice deaths served at two year trailing average growth rate is calculated by multiplying the number of reported hospice deaths (Step 4) by the statewide two year trailing average growth rate for deaths served for three years (Step 5) (# of reported deaths x 107.9% x 107.9% x 107.9%).

Step 6b: 2011 number of hospice deaths served limited to 60 percent is calculated by multiplying the projected 2011 deaths for each county (Step 2) by 60 percent.

Step 6c: Projected 2011 number of hospice deaths served is determined to be the lower of:

- (a) Projected 2011 number of hospice deaths served at two year trailing average growth rate (Step 6a), or;
- (b) Projected 2011 number of hospice deaths served limited to 60 percent (Step 6b).

Step 7: The "Two Year Trailing Average Growth Rate in Statewide Median Percent of Deaths Served" over the previous three years is calculated.

Year	Median Percent of Deaths Served	Growth
2006	27.02%	
2007	29.50%	9.2%
2008	29.70%	0.7%
Two Year	Trailing Average Growth Rate	4.9%

- Step 8: The projected median statewide percent of deaths served is calculated by multiplying the current statewide median percent of deaths served by the statewide two year trailing average growth rate for median percent of deaths served (Step 7) for three years (statewide median percent of deaths served x 104.9% x 104.9% x 104.9%).
- Step 9: Median projected 2011 hospice deaths is calculated by multiplying projected 2011 deaths (Step 3) by the projected statewide median percent of deaths served (Step 8).
- In counties for which additional hospice home care office need determinations were Step 10: made, determine the difference between 90 and the number of hospice patient deaths reported by each new office in the county for which a need determination was made. If a new office reports more than 90 hospice patient deaths in the county for which a need determination was made, the office's reported number of hospice patient deaths is not adjusted for that county. If a new office reported fewer than 90 hospice patient deaths in the county for which a need determination was made, an adjustment "placeholder" equal to the difference between the reported number of hospice patient deaths and 90 is used. The adjustment "placeholder" is made through the third annual Plan following either: a) issuance of the Certificate of Need if the approved applicant had a hospice home care office in the county prior to the issuance of the certificate; or, b) certification of the new office that received the Certificate of Need in the county for which a need determination was made if the approved applicant did not have an existing hospice home care office in the county prior to the issuance of the certificate.
- Step 11: Project the number of patients in need (deficit or surplus) by subtracting the median projected 2011 hospice deaths (Step 9) for each county from the projected 2011 number of hospice deaths served (Step 6c) plus any adjustment (Step 10).
- Step 12: The number of licensed hospice home care offices located in each county from annual data supplements to licensure applications is entered.

- Step 13: The number of licensed hospice home care offices per 100,000 population for each county is calculated by dividing the number of licensed hospice offices (Step 12) by the 2011 estimated population (Step 2) divided by 100,000.
- Step 14: A need determination would be made for a county if both of the following are true:
  - (a) The county's deficit (Step 11) is 90 or more, and;
  - (b) The county's number of licensed hospice home care offices per 100,000 population (Step 13) is three or less.

A hospice office's service area is the hospice planning area in which the hospice office is located. Each of the 100 counties in the State is a separate hospice planning area.

### **Hospice Inpatient Beds:**

- Step 1: The total number of reported hospice admissions, by county of patient residence, from annual data supplements to licensure applications is entered.
- <u>Step 2</u>: The total number of days of care, by county of patient residence, from annual data supplements to licensure applications is entered.
- Step 3: The average length of stay per admission (ALOS) is calculated by dividing total days of care (Step 2) by total admissions (Step 1).
- Step 4: The "Two Year Trailing Average Growth Rate in Statewide Number of Admissions" over the previous three years is calculated.

Year	Statewide # Hospice Admissions	Growth
2006	28,666	
2007	30,907	7.8%
2008	32,509	5.2%
Two Year	Trailing Average Growth Rate	6.5%

- Step 5a: 2013 admissions served at two year trailing average growth rate is calculated for each county by multiplying the total admissions (Step 1) by the statewide two year trailing average growth rate for hospice admissions (Step 4) for five years (total admissions x 106.5% x 106.5% x 106.5% x 106.5% x 106.5%).
- Step 5b: The 2003-2007 death rate/1000 population is entered.
- Step 5c: The estimated 2013 population of each county is entered with adjustments for the counties with more than 500 active duty military personnel.

- Step 5d: Projected 2013 deaths for each county is calculated by multiplying the county death rate (Step 5b) by the 2013 estimated population (Step 5c) divided by 1000.
- Step 5e: 2013 number of hospice deaths served limited to 60 percent is calculated by multiplying the projected 2013 deaths for each county (Step 5d) by 60 percent.
- Step 5f: The total number of reported hospice patient deaths, by county of patient residence, from annual data supplements to licensure applications is entered.
- Step 5g: The ratio of hospice admissions to hospice deaths by county is calculated by dividing reported hospice admissions (Step 1) by reported hospice deaths (Step 5f).
- Step 5h: 2013 number of hospice admissions served limited to 60 percent for each county is calculated by multiplying the county projected 2013 hospice deaths served limited to 60 percent (Step 5e) by the ratio of hospice admissions to hospice deaths for each county (Step 5g).
- Step 5i: Projected 2013 number of hospice admissions served is determined to be the lower of:
  - (a) Projected 2013 number of hospice admissions served at two year trailing average growth rate (Step 5a), or;
  - (b) Projected 2013 number of hospice admissions served limited to 60 percent (Step 5h).
- Step 6a: 2013 days of care at the county ALOS is calculated by multiplying the total 2013 admissions (Step 5i) by the ALOS per admission for each county (Step 3).
- Step 6b: 2013 days of care at the statewide ALOS is calculated by multiplying the total 2013 admissions (Step 5i) by the statewide median ALOS per admission.
- Step 6c: Projected 2013 days of care for inpatient estimates is determined to be the lower of:
  - (a) 2013 days of care at the county ALOS (Step 6a), or;
  - (b) 2013 days of care at the statewide ALOS (Step 6b).
- Step 7: Projected 2013 inpatient days is calculated for each county by multiplying the projected 2013 days of care for inpatient estimates (Step 6c) by 6 percent.
- Step 8: Projected inpatient hospice beds is calculated by dividing 2013 projected inpatient days (Step 7) by 365 days and then dividing by 0.85 to adjust for a targeted 85 percent occupancy.

- Step 9: Adjust the projected inpatient hospice beds (Step 8) by the number of licensed hospice beds in each county, CON approved/licensure pending beds, and beds available in previous Plans.
- Step 10: Calculate occupancy rates of existing hospice inpatient facilities based on 2009 annual data supplements to licensure application.
- Step 11: Adjust projected beds in Step 9 for occupancy rates of existing facilities in counties (Step 10) that are not at 85 percent occupancy. Indicate for such counties either zero or the deficit indicated in Step 9, which ever is greater. Further adjustments are made for CON approved closures.
- Step 12: For single counties with a projected deficit of six or more hospice inpatient beds, applications for single county Hospice Inpatient Units will be considered. The single county need equals the projected deficit. (A hospice inpatient facility bed's service area is the hospice inpatient facility bed planning area in which the bed is located. Each of the 100 counties in the State is a separate hospice inpatient facility bed planning area.)

The Long-Term and Behavioral Health Committee and the State Health Coordinating Council will consider petitions for adjusted need determinations that are filed in accordance with provisions outlined in Chapter 2 of the State Medical Facilities Plan.

Applicants for Certificate of Need are encouraged to contact the Certificate of Need Section to arrange pre-application conference prior to submission of application.

Table 13C: Year 2013 Hospice Inpatient Bed Need Projections for the Proposed 2010 Plan

Columb	Column B	Column	Column C   Column D   Column	Column F	Bed Need Projections for the Proposed 2010 Plan	Column G	Column H	Column	Column .1	Column K	Column 1	Column M
	500			2013 # of								
				Admissions at						Ratio of	2013 # of	
	ļ			Two Year	2003-2007	2013		2013 # of			Hospice	Projected 2013
	lotal	lotal Days	3014	railing	Death	Population	Designated 2042	Hospice	ZUUS Keported	Admissions to	Social imited	# or Hospice
County	(2008 data)	(2008 Data)	Admission	Growth Rate	Population	military)	Deaths	Limited to 60%	Patient Deaths	Deaths	to 60%	Served
Source or	ı	2009 Lic. Data		Col.B x 5 Yrs Growth at 6.5%	Deaths - NC Vital	Office of State Budget and	Col. Fx		2009 Lic. Data			Lower # of Admissions between Col. E and
rormula -/		Supplement	CO! C / CO! B	annualiy	Statistics	Management	(001.6/1000)	COI. H X 60%	Supplement	Col. B / Col. 3	COL. IX COLV	7.00.1
Alamance	684	56,443	82.5	937	9.7	162,865	1,580	948	969	1.1	1,088	937
Alexander	147	11,067	75.3	201	8.7	38,424		201	137	1.1	215	201
Alleghany	35	3,125	89.3	48	12.2	11,493		84	28		105	48
Anson	09	4,273	71.2	82	11.0	25,215	777	166	48	1.3	208	82
Ashe	6	5,872	60.5	133	11.7	27,354		192	69			133
Avery	58	3,437	59.3	62	10.6	18,458		117	40	1.5		79
Beaufort	164	20,468	124.8	225	11.6	47,544		331	137	1.2	396	225
Bertie	49	3,759	7.97	19	12.1	20,218	245	147	45	1.1	160	29
Bladen	177	19,440	109.8	243	11.9	32,273		230	115	1.5	322	243
Brunswick	457	37,370	81.8	626	9.6	121,417	1,166	669	339	1.3	643	626
Buncombe	1,024	76,337	74.5	1,403		243,037	2,455	1,473	986	1.1	1,613	1,403
Burke	391	32,773	83.8	989	9.7	94,591	918	551	347	1.1	620	536
Cabarrus	256	45,181	81.3	762		203,242	1	1,000	551	1.0	1,009	762
Caldwell	458	37,392	81.6	628		83,756	8	503	391	1.2	289	589
Camden	12	453	37.8	16		10,174		48	14		41	16
Carteret	275	20,724	75.4	377	11.0			423	212	1.3	549	377
Caswell	79	7,679	97.2	108				139	69	1.1	159	108
Catawba	808	62,861	7.77				1,	894	092	1.1	951	951
Chatham	211	18,235	86.4	289	9.1	68,775		376	157		202	289
Cherokee	82	3,005	36.6					208	62	1.3		112
Chowan	36	2,259	62.8					112	32			49
Clay	24	269				11,333		80	17			33
Cleveland	209	38,877				102,046	1,	643	479	1.3		815
Columbus	358	42,120				56,491		400	210		682	491
Craven	363	37,962	104.6	497		94,276		549	228			497
Cumberland	1,018	76,194		1,395		295,733	1,	1,189	713		1,	1,395
Currituck	63	4,540	72.1	98	8.0	22,716		109	52	1.2		98
Dare	99	2,453		06		31,964		146	58	1.1	166	06
Davidson	491	35,325		673	9.5	171,376	1,628	226	868	1.2	1,220	673
Davie	139	11,124		190		44,507		238	126	1.1	262	190
Duplin	218	25,669	117.7	588	6.6	56,054		333	125			299
Durham	909	44,400		830	6.9	295,588	2,	1,224	472		1,	830
Edgecombe	181	16,032	88.6	248	11.2	51,438			136	1.3		
Forsyth	1,225	87,840		1,678		372,699	3,205	1,923	1,088	1.1	2,165	1,678
Franklin	126	13,832	109.8	173	8.4	63,338		319	88	1.4	457	173
Gaston	941	62,553		1,289		227,635	2,276	1,366	844	1.1	1,523	1,289

Table 13C: Year 2013 Hospice Inpatient Bed Need Projections for the Proposed 2010 Plan

Column A	Column B	Column C	Column C   Column D   Colum	H L	Column F	Column	Golumn H	Column	Column J	Column K	Column	Column M
				2013 # of								
				Admissions at						Ratio of	2013 # of	
				Two Year	2003-2007	2013		2013 # of		Hospice	Hospice	Projected 2013
	Total	Total Days		Trailing	Death	Population		Hospice	2008 Reported	Ad	Admissions	# of Hospice
	Admissions	of Care	ALOS per	Average	Rate/1000	(excluding	Projected 2013	Projected 2013 Deaths Served	# of Hospice		Served Limited	Admissions
County	(2008 data)	(2008 Data)	_	Growth Rate	Population	military)	Deaths	Limited to 60%	Patient Deaths	Deaths	to 60%	Served
Source or	2009 Lic. Data	2009 Lic. Data		Col.B x 5 Yrs Growth at 6.5%	Deaths - NC Vital	Office of State Budget and	Col. F.x		2009 Lic. Data			Lower # of Admissions between Col. E and
Formula =>	Supplement	Supplement	Col. C / Col. B	annually	Statistics	Management	(Col.G/1000)	Col. H x 60%	Supplement	Col. B / Col. J	Col. I x Col K	Col. L
Gates	24	1,233	51.4	33	10.3	12,194	126		22	1.1		33
Graham	20	674		27	11.8	8,318	86	29	15	1.3	62	27
Granville	114	6,361	55.8	156	8.8	59,175	521	312	93			156
Greene	52	5,362	103.1	71	9.5	21,959	202		43		147	71
Guilford	1,442	132,055	91.6	1,976	8.1	510,395	4,134	2,	1,229		2,	1,976
Halifax	145	11,289	6.77	199	11.6	54,807	989		123		450	199
Harnett	226	44,030	76.0	793	7.7	123,950	954		323		1,	793
Haywood	284	16,943	265	389	11.9	58,505	969		231			389
Henderson	841	72,202	85.9	1,152	12.6	112,710	1,	852	764	1.1	938	938
Hertford	85	5,024		116	12.1	23,636			84	1.0		116
Hoke	108	16,223	150.2	148	9.9	48,765	322		82		7	148
Hyde	55	9,591		75	12.1	5,333			42	1.3		51
Iredell	909	38,158		828	9.8	175,291	1,		929	1.1	984	829
Jackson	135	9,122	9.79	185	0.6	39,763			124	1.1	234	185
Johnston	425	36,490		582	7.1	193,025	1,		271		1,290	585
Jones	49	5,302	,	29	10.6	10,325		99	31			29
Lee	225	22,407		308	A 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	63,500	584		156			308
Lenoir	216	17,305		296		57,272		409	129			296
Lincoln	261	21,699		358		84,676			216			358
McDowell	167	11,391	68.2	229		47,508	480	288	124			229
Macon	142	9,877		195	12.8	37,279			115	1.2	354	195
Madison	97	4,263		133		22,089	247		85			133
Martin	93	902'9	70.0	127		23,427			75		228	127
Mecklenburg	2,323	170,393		3,183		962,350	ů.	3,	1,967		4,	3,103
Mitchell	83	12,606		114	12.6	16,158	204		73			114
Montgomery	06	8,684		123		28,260			61			123
Moore	437	41,377	94.7	299		92,683	1,084		344			299
Nash	259	19,697		322	6.6	100,239		595	219			355
New Hanover	847	64,093		1,160		205,450	1,705	1	725	1.2	1,	1,160
Northampton	54	4,115		74	13.3	20,953	279		47			74
Onslow	265	16,477	62.2	898		158,245			194			363
Orange	430	24,649		689	2.5	138,507	789	474	352			629
Pamlico	29	2,488		40		12,841			25	1.2		40
Pasquotank	107	8,124		147	9.4	41,776			66	1.1	255	147
Pender	210	15,819		288		60,087	523	314	179	1.2	368	288
Perquimans	40	1,882	47.1	55	11.8	14,267			33	1.2	122	CC

Table 13C: Year 2013 Hospice Inpatient Bed Need Projections for the Proposed 2010 Plan

Column M	Projected 2013 # of Hospice Admissions	Served	Lower # of Admissions between Col. E and Col. L	167	544	187	777	314	980	386	671	267	400	285	332	269	611	74	225	5	545	140		2,699	2,699	2,699	2,699	2,699	2,699 29 32 101 678	2,699 29 32 101 678	2,699 29 32 101 678 227 303	2,699 29 32 32 101 678 527 303	2,699 29 32 32 101 678 678 227 227 212 182
Column L	2013 # of Hospice F Admissions Served Limited	to 60%	Col. 1 x Col K	301	953	187	911	457	1,327	089	1,099	292	168	285	407	306	644	138	295	17	266	370	3,929		221	221	221	221 89 265	221 89 265 842	221 89 265 842 502	221 89 265 265 842 502 650	221 89 265 842 502 650 650	221 89 842 842 502 650 650 797 182
Column K	Ratio of Hospice Admissions to Hospice		Col. B / Col. J	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.7	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.9	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.2	1.3	8.0	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.6	2	2	1.0	1.3	1.0	1.3	1.0	13 13 13 13 12 12 13	13 13 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14
Column J	2008 Reported # of Hospice	Patient Deaths	2009 Lic. Data Supplement	86	327	189	489	158	411	267	398	419	156	203	225	178	345	45	130	2	337	78	1,536	13			23	23	23 55 374	23 55 374 138	23 55 374 138 174	23 55 374 138 174 127	23 55 374 138 174 174 127
Column I	2013 # of Hospice Deaths Served	Limited to 60%	Col. H x 60%	242	282	170	282	315			893	200	410	238	378	278	498	115	234	21	844	283	3,064	137	00	00	60	197	197	1004	1 6 6	1 9 4 6	1041014
Column H	Projected 2013	Deaths	Col. F x (Col. G/1000)	403	1,308	284	1,309	525	1,271	1,073	1,488	833	683	396	631	463	830	192	390	35	1,407	471	5,106	228	148	148	2	328	1,061	1,061	328 1,061 696 853	328 1,061 696 853 405	328 1,061 696 853 853 405
Column G	2013 Population (excluding	military)	Office of State Budget and Management	38,014	174,348	19,176	150,477	47,316	136,689	92,468	150,273	67,215	70,460	38,860	62,426	48,281	75,475	14,790	32,466	4,323	238,454	43,654	1,042,038	19,834	12,993	12,993		48,221	48,221	48,221 114,062 68,872	48,221 114,062 68,872 84,499	48,221 114,062 68,872 84,499 40,133	48,221 114,062 68,872 84,499 40,133
Column F	2003-2007 Death Rate/1000	Population	Deaths - NC Vital Statistics	10.6	2.7	14.8	8.7	11.1	9.3	11.6	6.6	12.4	9.7	10.2	10.1	9.6	11.0	13.0	12.0	8.1	5.9	10.8	4.9	11.5	11.4	11.4		8.9	6.8	9.3	6.8 9.3 10.1	6.8 9.3 10.1 10.1	6.8 9.3 10.1 10.1 11.2
Column E	2013 # of Admissions at Two Year Trailing Average	Growth Rate	Col.B x 5 Yrs Growth at 6.5% annually	167	244	285	777	314	980	386	671	651	400	333	332	269	611	74	225	9	545	140	2,699	29	32	32		101	101	101 678 227	101 678 227 303	101 678 227 303 303 212	101 678 227 303 303 182
Column D	ALOS per	Admission	Col. C / Col. B	78.9	103.9	8.98	83.6	145.3	143.1	63.6	9.89	116.0	121.8	0.68	58.2	130.2	116.4	80.9	66.4	37.0	64.0	93.7	77.2	27.0	77.3	77.3		82.7	82.7	82.7 64.5 66.8	82.7 64.5 66.8 105.3	82.7 64.5 66.8 105.3 80.6	82.7 64.5 66.8 105.3 80.6 125.0
Column C	Total Days of Care	(2008 Data)	2009 Lic. Data Supplement	9,626	41,234	18,054	47,403	33,280	102,348	17,926	33,622	55,092	35,579	21,624	14,086	25,519	51,917	4,370	10,894	148	25,461	9,553	152,008	292	1,777	1,777		6,121	6,121	6,121 31,945 11,086	6,121 31,945 11,086 23,263	6,121 31,945 11,086 23,263 12,495	6,121 31,945 11,086 23,263 12,495 16,626
Column B	Total Admissions	(2008 data)	2009 Lic. Data Supplement	122	397	208	292	229	715	282	490	475	292	243	242	196	446	54	164	4	398	102	1,970	21	23	23		74	74	74 495 166	74 495 166 221	74 495 166 221	74 495 166 221 155 133
Column A	ž	County	Source or Formula =>	Person	Pitt	Polk	Randolph	Richmond	Robeson	Rockingham	Rowan	Rutherford	Sampson	Scotland	Stanly	Stokes	Surry	Swain	Transylvania	Tyrrell	Union	Vance	Wake	Warren	Washington	Washington		Watauga	Watauga Wayne	Watauga Wayne Wilkes	Watauga Wayne Wilkes Wilson	Watauga Wayne Wilkes Wilson Yadkin	Watauga Wayne Wilkes Wilson Yadkin Yancev

			_																																			
Column W	Deficit/(Surplus) Adjusted for facilities not at 85% occupancy (Col.)		(0)	(0)	0 -		2	1	(3)	1	4	2	5	(0)	(3)	(0)	0	5	2	(3)	4	_	-	0	1	-	0	0	_	1	1	3	-	(0)	4	(7)	3	0
Column V	Existing Facility Occupancy Rate	200	00 470/	92.17%									100.00%		54.50%	90.16%				100.00%					99.51%			57.48%								100.00%		32.66%
Column U	Adjusted Projected Beds	Col. R - (Col. S + Col. T)	100	9	0 -	-	2	1	(3)	1	4	2	5	(0)	(3)	(0)	0	5	2	(3)	4	-	1	0	1		0	12	1	1	1	3	1	(0)	4		3	4
Column T	CON Appv'd/Lic. Pending/ Prev. Need Determ.		0	Ø					9			7		8	8	3				9					4	9	7									10		7
Column S	Currently Licensed Beds	Licensure		٥									15		9	9				11					5			8			8		3	12		20		9
Column R	Projected Total Inpatient Beds	(Col. Q/365) / 85%	7.7	14	0	1	2	1	3	1	4	9	20	8	11	6	0	5	2	14	4	-	-	0	10	7		20	1	1	6	3	4	12	4	23		17
Column Q	Projected Inpatient Days	Col. P * 6%	4 040	4,342	222	351	483	283	1,041	309	1,123	2,901	6,275	2,482	3,529	2,727	37	1,704	501	4,406	1,339	247	186	22	3,131	2,272	2,304	6,264	373	202	2,904	882	1,384	3,650	1,149	7,221	800	5,142
Column P	Projected 2013 Days of Care for Inpatient Estimates	Lower # of Days of Care between Col. N and Col. O	030.07	12,359	3 703	5,855	8,045	4,709	17,349	5,150	18,725	48,345	104,591	41,363	58,818	45,450	621	28,394	8,357	73,441	22,321	4,117	3,095	955	52,179	37,872	38,401	104,395	6,220	3,361	48,399	14,705	23,062	60,833	19,148	120,351	13,329	85,705
Column O	2013 Days of Care at Statewide ALOS	Col. M x Statewide Median ALOS per Admission (77.2)	030.05	12,339	3 703	6.347	10,261	6,136	17,349	5,184	18,725	48,345	108,327	41,363	58,818	45,450	1,269	29,092	8,357	73,441	22,321	8,675	3,808	2,539	62,903	37,872	38,401	107,692	6,665	6,982	51,942	14,705	23,062	64,108	19,148	129,591	13,329	99,547
Column N	2013 Days of Care at County ALOS	Col. D x Col.M	27.000	17,333	13,163	5.855	8,045	4,709	28,044	5,150	26,635	51,201	104,591	44,903	61,903	48,058	621	28,394	10,521	73,908	24,984	4,117	3,095	922	52,179	602,76	52,012	104,395	6,220	3,361	48,399	15,241	35,170	60,833	21,966	120,351	18,951	85,705
Column A	County	Source or Formula =>		Alamance	Allogham	Anson	Ashe	Avery	Beaufort	Bertie	Bladen	Brunswick	Buncombe	Burke	Cabarrus	Caldwell	Camden	Carteret	Caswell	Catawba	Chatham	Cherokee	Chowan	Clay	Cleveland	Columbus	Craven	Cumberland	Currituck	Dare	Davidson	Davie	Duplin	Durham	Edgecombe	Forsyth	Franklin	Gaston

	Column O Column	Column	<u>a</u>	Column Q	Column R	Column S	Column P Column Q Column R Column S Column T Column U	Column U	Column V	Column W
Projected 2013 Days of 2013 Days of Care at Care for Projected	Projected 2013 Days of Care for Projected	Projected			Projected Total	Currently	CON Appv'd/Lic. Pending/	Adjusted		Deficit/(Surplus) Adjusted for facilities not at
County Statewide Inpatient Inpatient In ALOS Estimates Days	Inpatient Inpatient Estimates Days	Inpatient Days		-	Inpatient Beds	Licensed Beds	Prev. Need Determ.	Projected Beds	Occupancy Rate	85% occupancy (Col)
Col. D x Col .M A Statewide of Care between Median ALOS per Col. D x Col .M Admission (77.2) O Col. P • 6% (Col.	Lower # of Days Col. M x Statewide of Care between Median ALOS per Admission (77.2) O Col. P • 6%	Col. P * 6%		(Col	(Col. Q/365) / 85%	Licensure		Col. R - (Col. S + Col. T)	2009 Lic. Data Supplement	4
1689   2.539   1.689   101	2.539 1 689		101		0			C		0
2,116 923	2,116 923		55		0			0		0
12,060 8,715	12,060 8,715		523		2			2		2
5,501 5,501	5,501		330		1			1		1
152,547 152,547 9	152,547		9,153		30	14		16	80.82%	0
15,339 15,339	15,339 15,339		920		8			8		3
61,251 60,326	61,251 60,326		3,620		12	7	-	4	58.43%	0
30,044 23,214	23,214		1,393		4		9	(2)		(2)
72,421 72,421 4,	72,421 72,421		4,345		14	19		(2)	80.19%	(5)
8,992 6,883	8,992 6,883		413		-					-
11,425 11,425	11,425		989		2			2		2
3,915 3,915	3,915 3,915	ľ	235		-			-		-
64,002 52,281 3,	64,002 52,281 3,	'n	3,137		10	6			92.92%	-
14,281 12,498	14,281 12,498		750		2					2
44,960 44,960 2	44,960 44,960		2,698		6		12	(3)		(3)
5,184	5,184 5,184		311					_		-
23,802 23,802	23,802 23,802		1,428		2			5		5
22,850 22,850	22,850 22,850		1,371		4			4		4
27,611 27,611 1	27,611 27,611 1	-	1,657		2		9	<del>(</del> 1)		(1)
17,667 15,607	17,667 15,607		936		3			80		3
15,022 13,533	15,022 13,533		812		3			. 3		3
5,841 10,261 5,841 350	10,261 5,841		320		- 0			-		- 0
245 25 23 458 14	2745 233 458 17	11	14 007		AF	10		30	80 00%	40
8 780	8 780		527		200			3	20000	0
0,100	0,100		574		10			10		4 0
9,020	9,020	1	0.77		40		1	7		7
46,229 46,229	46,229		2,114		ם מ		11	(2)		(5)
27,399 26,987	27,399 26,987		1,619		5		9	(1)		(1)
89,603 87,815 5	89,603 87,815		5,269		17	12		5	98.72%	5
5,713 5,638	5,713 5,638		338		1			1		1
	28,034 22,575		1,355		4			4		7
33,171 44,679 33,171 1,990	33,171	1	1,990		9	9		0	100.00%	0
3,409 3,068 3,068 184	3,068 3,068		184		1			-		1
11,131 11,319 11,131 668	11,131		899		2			2		2
22,216 21,674 1,	22,216 21,674		1,300		4			7		7
2,579 4,232 2,579 155	4,232 2,579		155		0			0		0
				l						

2			5			-			
2013 Days of Care at County ALOS	Care at Statewide ALOS	Projected 2013 Days of Care for Inpatient Estimates	Projected Inpatient Days	Projected Total Inpatient Beds	Currently Licensed Beds	CON Appv'd/Lic. Pending/ Prev. Need Determ.	Adjusted Projected Beds	Existing Facility Occupancy Rate	Deficit/(Surplus) Adjusted for facilities not at 85% occupancy (Col)
	0 -	Lower # of Days of Care between Col. N and Col.		(Col. Q/365) /	Licensure		Col. R - (Col.	2009 Lic. Data	
COI. D.X.COI.M	Admission (77.2)	0	Col. P. 6%	%2%	Inventory		2+00.1)	Supplement	
13,189	12,906	12,906	774	2			2		2
56,495		41,998	2,520		8		0	0.00%	0
16,266	14,469	14,469	898	3			8		3
64,948	59,982	59,982	3,599	12		9	9		9
45,597	24,226	24,226	1,454			9	(1)		1)
140,229	75,639	75,639	4,538	1	12	14	(11)	44.81%	(11
24,561		24,561	1,474		3		2	56.41%	0
46,066		46,066	2,764	6		7	2		2
65,753	3 43,772	43,772	2,626		4	9	(2)	98.29%	(2
48,747		30,890	1,853				9		9
25,333		21,981	1,319	7	4	7	(2)		(2
19,299		19,299	1,158				4		4
34,964		20,734	1,244			7	(3)		(3
71,132	2 47,182	47,182	2,831	6	13		(4)		(4
5,987			343				1		1
14,926	3 17,349	14	896	3			3		3
203		203	12				0		0
34,885		34,885	2,093			9	1		1
13,089	10,790	10,790	647	2			2		7
208,269	70	208,269	12,496	40	6	18	16	82.38%	0
777	7 2,222	777	47				0		0
2,435		2,433	146				0		0
8,386	3 7,828	7,828	470	7			2		7
43,768	3 52,365	43,768	2,626		9	9	(4)	100.00%	(4)
15,189	17,561	15,189	911	3			3		3
31,873		23,379	1,403	2		8	)		8)
17,120	16,397	16,397	984				3		3
22,780		14,070	844				3		က
3.439.070	3,439,070	3,439,070	206,344	999	248	208		84.13%	